

REMARKS

Applicant submits this Amendment together with a Request for Continued Examination. Applicant submits that the claims are patentable for the reasons given below.

The Examiner has held that the phrase "inserted permanently into the network" is vague. Applicant has therefore removed this phrase from the claims, and has substituted a more precise recitation. Specifically, the claims now recite that the client is connected to a network of the server only through the representative of the authority, and that the representative of the authority is used throughout all transactions established between the client and the server.

Support for the new claim language is found throughout the specification. For example, see page 6, lines 9-12 (communication between the server and the client may be established only under the control of the representative of the authority); page 7, lines 7-9 (the representative of the authority effects all necessary verifications); page 7, lines 20-23 (communication between the client and server is set up only through the representative of the authority).

Applicant submits that the amended claim language overcomes the rejection under Section 112.

With regard to the rejection over Urien in view of Doe, the Examiner has admitted that Urien does not show a representative of an authority inserted permanently between a client and a server, such that communication between client and server occurs only through the representative of the

authority. The Examiner therefore relies on Doe for its supposed teaching of the above feature.

Applicant submits that Doe does not supply what is missing in Urien, for the following reasons.

In analyzing Doe, the Examiner implicitly identifies the smart card 118 as the client, and identifies the computer 102 as the server. The Examiner also identifies the encryption device or hub 110 as the "representative of the authority".

Although there is communication between the hub 110 and the computer 102, there is no direct or indirect communication between the smart card 118 and the computer 102. Since the card is used for mutual authentication by the encryption device 110, a person of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that there would be a major security breach if information from the smart card "leaked" from the encryption device to the computer. In fact, this physical separation is one of the reasons for using the encryption device.

The patent to Doe contains no explicit statement that there is communication between the smart card 118 and the computer 102. Moreover, such communication would be considered very harmful, as it would represent a security vulnerability. Therefore, Doe cannot be deemed to suggest communication between the smart card and the computer.

In summary, Doe does not suggest a system in which there is communication between client and server, made only through a representative of an authority which handles all transactions between client and server. Therefore, Doe does not supply what is missing in Urien. The combination of Doe and Urien therefore does not yield what is claimed in Claims 1 and 4.

For the reasons given above, Applicant submits that Claims 1 and 4 are allowable over Urien and Doe. The remaining claims are dependent from the above claims, and are therefore also believed allowable.

Applicant submits that the application, as amended, is in condition for allowance. Applicant requests reconsideration by the Examiner, and early favorable action.